

supplies, and contractual services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

RFP 86-19	Chapter I Services for Nonpublic School Students	
	Awardee: Nonpublic Educational Services	\$ 71,893
133-87	Building Materials	
	Awardee(s):	
	Allied Plywood Corporation	\$ 4,493
	Greenwald Industrial Products	6,145
	Mann and Parker Lumber Co.	13,191
	Metro Buildings Supply	30,578

	TOTAL	\$ 54,407
186-87	Power Mowers and Lawn and Garden Tractors	
	Awardee(s):	
	Gaithersburg Ford Tractor	\$ 29,640*
	Gladhill Brothers	6,940

	TOTAL	\$ 36,580
191-87	Color Television Communications Studio System	
	Awardee(s):	
	Capitol Radio Wholesalers, Inc.	\$ 1,113
	CTL	90,652*
	Kipp & Son, Inc.	3,920
	R & R Lighting Co., Inc.	6,080*
	Radio Shack	4,013
	Ritz Camera Centers, Inc.	11,376

	TOTAL	\$117,154
197-87	Telephone Systems and Equipment	
	Awardee:	
	North Supply Company	\$ 44,653

* Asterisk denotes MFD vendors.

RESOLUTION NO. 391-87 Re: AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE -- P. L. 874
(IMPACT AID)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Federal guidelines covering the P. L. 874 program (Impact Aid) require formal action by local boards of education to designate an authorized representative to submit requests for P. L. 874 funds; and

WHEREAS, It is the intention of the Board of Education to have the superintendent of schools serve as the authorized representative for all matters related to the P. L. 874 program, including the filing of reports requesting federal funds; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Resolution 753-83, adopted September 13, 1983, be rescinded; that Dr. Harry Pitt, superintendent of schools, serve as the authorized representative in all matters related to the P. L. 874 program, Impact Aid, including the filing of requests for federal funds; and that this action be effective as of the date of his appointment as superintendent of schools, July 1, 1987.

RESOLUTION NO. 392-87 Re: BURNING TREE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -
REROOFING (AREA 2)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 21, 1987, for reroofing Burning Tree Elementary School as follows:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$ 96,168
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	118,028
3. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	118,748
4. Raintree Industries, Inc.	132,500
5. H. T. Harrison & Sons, Inc.	200,585

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, Low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$96,168 be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for reroofing Burning Tree Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 393-87 Re: STADIUM LIGHTING AT BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE
AND COL. ZADOK MAGRUDER HIGH SCHOOLS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on July 23, 1987, to install stadium lights at Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Col. Zadok Magruder High Schools as shown below:

SCHOOL	BIDDER	COST
B-CC HS	Vignola Electric	\$65,656
Magruder HS	Vignola Electric	59,595
B-CC HS	S. Rock/Estabrook Corp.	72,000
Magruder HS	S. Rock/Estabrook Corp.	82,000

and

WHEREAS, The Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Col. Zadok Magruder High Schools' booster clubs have sufficient funds to pay the total cost; and

WHEREAS, Plans and specifications have been submitted to the Planning Board under mandatory referral; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board request the County Council for an FY 1988 Capital Budget emergency appropriation in the amount of \$125,251 and an amendment to the FY 1988-93 Capital Improvements Program to establish a project for stadium lights for Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Col. Zadok Magruder High Schools with private contributions as the source of funds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$125,251 be awarded to Vignola to furnish and install stadium lights at Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Col. Zadok Magruder High Schools in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities contingent upon:

- o Receipt of funds from the schools' booster clubs
- o Final action by the Planning Board
- o Approval by the County Council of an emergency appropriation and amendment to the FY 1988-93 Capital Improvements Program;

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of the emergency appropriation and amendment to the Capital Improvements Program.

RESOLUTION NO. 394-87 Re: GRANT OF STORM SEWER EASEMENT AND
RIGHT-OF-WAY TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY,
MARYLAND, AT THE FUTURE MOYER ROAD
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITE (AREA 3)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is the owner and developer of ten acres on the south side of Moyer Road, west of Woodfield Road (MD 124), on which it plans to construct the Moyer Road Elementary School for opening in September, 1988; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection has requested, in conjunction with the Board's construction, a Grant of Storm Sewer Easement and Right-of-way for the installation of a reinforced concrete pipe and outfall protection along the eastern boundary of the school site; and

WHEREAS, Installation of the storm sewer facility will benefit the school site, with all future maintenance to be performed at no cost to the Board of Education and with the Montgomery County Government and contractors to assume liability for all future damages or injury; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a Grant of Storm Sewer Easement and Right-of-Way to the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection at the future Moyer Road Elementary School site for the purpose of installing a storm sewer facility.

RESOLUTION NO. 395-87 Re: CHANGE ORDER ACTIVITY OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Change order proposals Number 12, new parking lot, and Number 13, on-site sanitary system modifications, for Cedar Grove Elementary School have been reviewed by Department of School Facilities staff and recommended for approval by the project architect; and

WHEREAS, These two change orders have depleted the project contingency, and it is necessary to have additional funds for the completion of the project; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That change order proposals, Number 12 and Number 13, for Cedar Grove Elementary School be approved and that the general contract be amended accordingly; and be it further

RESOLVED, That \$40,000 be transferred from the local unliquidated surplus account (969) to Cedar Grove Elementary School (703-04) to replenish the project contingency; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this transfer to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 396-87 Re: GRANT OF UTILITY EASEMENT TO POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY AND THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY AT THE FORMER LAKE NORMANDY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 398-87 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1988 GRANT PROPOSAL
TO DEVELOP AN ELEMENTARY PRIMARY DRUG
PREVENTION PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1988 grant proposal for \$200,000 to the United States Department of Education for development of a model demonstration project for primary prevention in elementary schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 399-87 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1988 FUTURE SUPPORTED
PROJECT FUNDS FOR A WATER QUALITY
ANALYSIS PROJECT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1988 Provision for Future Supported Projects a \$2,500 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education, Environmental Education, for a Water Quality Analysis Project in Category 3, Other Instructional Costs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 400-87 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS AND TRANSFERS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointments and transfers be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Elizabeth Boone	Principal Banneker JHS	Principal Sherwood HS Effective: 8-1-87
John P. Graham	Principal Mont. Village JHS	Principal Magruder HS Effective: 8-1-87
TRANSFER	FROM	TO

Nancy Hoveman	Assistant Principal Martin Luther King JHS	Assistant Principal Seneca Valley HS Effective: 7-28-87
---------------	---	---

NAME AND PRESENT POSITION	POSITION EFFECTIVE JULY 28, 1987	POSITION EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1988
------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Walter Tozier Principal Personal Ill. Leave	A&S Teacher	A&S Assignment to be Determined
---	-------------	------------------------------------

Russell Fleury Asst. Principal Earle B. Wood JHS	A&S Teacher	Assignment to be Determined
--	-------------	--------------------------------

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
----------	------	----

J. Richard Stevenson	Principal Stedwick ES	Principal Clopper Mill ES Effective: 7-28-87
----------------------	--------------------------	--

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
-------------	------------------	----

James G. Fernandez	Admin. Intern E. Brooke Lee IS	Assistant Principal M. L. King JHS Effective: 7-28-87
--------------------	-----------------------------------	---

Wayne Fleeger	Admin. Intern Churchill HS	Assistant Principal R. Montgomery HS Effective: 7-28-87
---------------	-------------------------------	---

Ann P. Hare	Admin. Intern Rockville HS	Assistant Principal Rockville HS Effective: 7-28-87
-------------	-------------------------------	---

Maxine Jenkins	Admin. Intern Paint Branch HS	Assistant Principal Paint Branch HS Effective: 7-28-87
----------------	----------------------------------	--

Mark E. Kelsch	Admin. Intern Julius West MS	Assistant Principal Sligo MS Effective: 7-28-87
----------------	---------------------------------	---

Ruth Koenigsberg	Admin. Intern Damascus HS	Assistant Principal Damascus HS Effective: 7-28-87
------------------	------------------------------	--

Joyce Martoccia-Hagel	Admin. Intern White Oak IS	Assistant Principal White Oak IS Effective: 7-28-87
-----------------------	-------------------------------	---

Darryl Norwood	PPW Intern Area 1 Admin. Office	Pupil Pers. Worker Area 1 Admin. Office Effective: 7-28-87
----------------	------------------------------------	--

Felicia Lanham-Tarason	PPW Intern Area 1 Admin. Office	Pupil Pers. Worker Area 1 Admin. Office Effective: 7-28-87
Sherri K. Rindler	Acting Asst. Principal Diamond ES	Assistant Principal Oakland Terrace ES Effective: 7-28-87
E. Randolph Tekeley	Senior Performance Analyst & Capacity Planner Federal National Mortgage Association Washington, D.C.	Supervisor of Tech. Support Div. Data Processing Operations Effective: 8-17-87

Re: EDUCATION OF MINORITY STUDENTS

Dr. Pitt stated that this evening they would present and discuss the school-based accountability and management process. He was pleased with the work of the staff and believed they were moving forward in a very positive way. They were moving toward a local school accountability process which would identify criteria for measuring local school progress, establish countywide improvement goals, and monitor and report school progress toward these goals on a yearly basis. In addition to the criteria they were putting in place now, there were other criteria that would be put in place at the end of this year. He wanted to move toward inclusion of participation in higher level courses and algebra, Grade 9, as an entry level to higher mathematics. He believed there was a good possibility of being able to use school tests, but he had a concern about moving to a system-wide standardized examination. He was in favor of keeping the schoolwide departmental exams, and he believed they could be used as one of the criteria. He hoped that this could be finished this spring.

In regard to criterion-referenced tests, Dr. Pitt believed these were fill-ins to close the gaps between the California Achievement Tests, but again he believed that a lot of work needed to be done here. He was not sure they would be ready this spring to use those specifically. He explained that the major change was local school accountability which was new. They had had countywide goals in the past and continued to have countywide goals. In the past they had published these goals and the results of local school test scores. However, in his opinion, this was not local school accountability because it did not show anything in terms of what a particular local school had done. It did not show where the youngsters had started and what progress had been made. This was critical to him, and this would be reported on a school by school basis. In addition, they would use the area management plan as a basic approach to the development of individual school objectives. He had asked Dr. Vance to develop a monitoring plan. At the moment Dr. Vance was considering two approaches. One was to have a specific person in each area who would be responsible for having all local school data.

Dr. Paul Scott, director of minority education and coordination, would have a direct line to that person, and if Dr. Scott had concerns he could call up the area associate superintendent. The other approach was to have one person in the Department of Educational Accountability responsible for working with each of these areas and getting the data together. Dr. Pitt reported that he was leaning toward the area concept. The bottom line was that Dr. Scott had to have the ability to get that information quickly. That part of this plan would be in place in the next few weeks. Dr. Scott would have responsibility for refining and developing this plan. Dr. Pitt gave special thanks to Dr. Sylvia Johnson of Howard University for her help as a consultant.

Dr. Scott stated that he was pleased with the support he had received from the staff in developing and refining the process. He explained that there were several basic components to the overall concept and approach. The first was to set a system-wide criteria for measuring local school progress in achievement and participation that were challenging, yet sensitive to individual school circumstances, and examined student progress over time. The second was to monitor and report progress towards these goals on a yearly basis. The third was to recognize those schools that had met or exceeded their goals, those that were making progress, and provide support and direction for those having difficulty. Beginning with the 1987-88 school year, system-wide and local school progress would be monitored for accountability purposes in three specific areas: the CAT battery in Grades 3 to 5 and 5 to 8; the Maryland Functional Tests in reading, mathematics, writing, and citizenship; and the identification of gifted and talented students at the elementary and J/I/M level. With respect to the CAT, Dr. Scott said their goal would be that 50 percent or more of the black and Hispanic students who took the CAT battery in Grade 3 and scored in stanines 1 to 3 would score at stanine 4 or above in Grade 5. Fifteen percent or more of the black and Hispanic students who scored in stanines 4 to 6 would score at stanines 7 to 9 in Grade 5. The percentage of high achieving black and Hispanic students scoring in stanines 7 to 9 in Grade 5 would be equal to or greater than the percentage of students who scored in stanines 7 to 9 in Grade 3. The intent was to measure growth of the same students over time from Grades 3 to 5 and Grades 5 to 8. In the past they had examined different groups of students at a fixed point in time.

Dr. Scott explained that the intent was to focus in on students at all points along the continuum, setting goals for students who began as low achievers, for those who began as average achievers, and for those who began as high achievers. Again, the focus would be on monitoring progress over time.

The second area identified was their goal for the Maryland Functional Tests. The ultimate goal was for all students to pass these tests by the time they had met all other graduation requirements. However, there were some intermediate goals that would lead to that. The goal of all junior high schools with ninth grade would be that black and

Hispanic students in MCPS for two or more years would have a passing rate of at least 80 percent on these tests by the time they completed ninth grade. The goal for all senior high schools would be that black and Hispanic students who had been in Montgomery County for two or more years would have a passing rate of at least 90 percent by the time they had completed tenth grade. The focus would be on students who had been in the school system for two or more years. They intended to report the cumulative percents of students passing rather than reporting the results of a single test administration which was what they did now.

With respect to gifted and talented, they were proposing that they continue with the goal they had presently. That goal was the expectation that a steady increase would occur of identifying gifted and talented students at the elementary and J/I/M levels until the proportion of each racial and ethnic group was approximately the same. Dr. Scott reported that the process for monitoring was essentially a management process which had been in place, particularly in Area 1, for several years. Each school was required to set objectives and implementation plans based on the assessment of progress the previous year. The principal and leadership staff would complete the analysis with guidance from the supervisor of instruction, and the area associate superintendent had the responsibility for approving those plans. There was a formal midyear review as well as an end-of-the-year assessment. In addition to these areas, the management process also looked at school climate. In addition, they would address suspensions, attendance, management practices including allocation of resources, and organizing for instruction. In August they would have two reports to the Board on an annual basis. The first would report the system-wide progress, and the second would report the individual school-by-school progress.

Dr. Pitt emphasized that in the next few weeks there would be an identified person at the area or DEA level with direct liaison with Dr. Scott so that he would have easy access to this data. Dr. Scott would have access to the superintendent, deputy, and associate superintendents. He hoped that Dr. Scott would work out problems with the area superintendent which was critical.

Mrs. DiFonzo noted that the title of the paper was "Education of Minority Students." In Montgomery County they defined minority students as Asian, black, and Hispanic. However, the paper addressed only blacks and Hispanics. She asked for staff's reasoning on this point. She asked how their expectations of outcomes might be different if they had included Oriental youngsters.

Dr. Scott replied that historically Priority 2 had focused on black and Hispanic students, and that was the focus that they had maintained. This year he had also been very involved with the Asian community in trying to identify their needs, but they had continued to focus as far as Priority 2 was concerned on the needs of black and Hispanic students. He thought that when they began to delve into issues of this kind, they ended up dealing with the needs of all students. Dr. Pitt added that their major focus was to try to see

that all young people in the school system achieved to their potential. Past history had been that black and Hispanic youngsters had not achieved at the same level. However, as they looked at accountability and growth at the school level, he thought it would influence their looking at all young people who were not achieving, were falling behind, or could be going higher.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that statistically youngsters of Asian heritage tended to do as a group very well, but they also knew that there was a substantial number of those youngsters who were not doing very well. She wanted to make sure that they did not lose sight of those youngsters and their needs. She asked what their expectations would be in terms of achieving results if they had included Oriental youngsters in this. Dr. Scott replied that the expectation would be the same. In all cases, they would expect progress and that all students would achieve. However, the focus of this had been on black and Hispanic students, and it was difficult for him to say what the influence would have been if they looked at it in a different light. In regard to Dr. Scott's authority, Dr. Cronin asked if he would be part of the review and approval of the school plans at the area level and if he could object to the plan or add to it. Dr. Scott replied that he could. Dr. Pitt had spoken earlier to the link between the area office and Dr. Scott's role. Dr. Pitt added that in their last discussion this was clear. He thought that if Dr. Scott was going to be effective in his role he needed to be able to access the data quickly. He also noted that part of the plan was having Dr. Scott step in and say there was a problem.

Dr. Cronin asked how they arrived at the 15 percent and 50 percent in the numbers. Dr. Steven Frankel, director of DEA, replied that the numbers came out of a consensus process from the committee chaired by Dr. Carl Smith. They took where the system was as a whole for the last three years and then what would represent a reasonable amount of improvement and a goal for all schools. This was an ambitious goal. For example, on the California tests the toughest one would be the middle group because MCPS did much better at the high and low end than they did in the middle. There were two full days of debate before those specific numbers were set. Dr. Pitt agreed that these were ambitious goals, but he felt that a goal should be someplace where someone had to reach for it. He was hopeful that they could reach those goals, but he could not predict that they would. He believed that the critical point was that they look at individual schools to see progress or a lack of progress. Where a lack of progress occurred, they needed to identify those schools and work with them as quickly as they could. He hoped that the process of identifying successful strategies could be passed on to those schools.

Dr. Cronin asked if they would have intermediate goals set if a school had a four year goal, for example. Dr. Scott replied that this would be done through the process he had described with the area superintendent. The objectives and plan for each school would take into account the unique circumstances of a particular situation. Dr.

Cronin asked if the goals would be made public. Dr. Scott replied that they had to work on this part in terms of the reporting. If interim goals were set, they would be acknowledged in that report.

Dr. Cronin asked what would happen if the goal was not reached by a fifth grade and what pressure would be put on the teacher. Dr. Scott replied that there would not be pressure on any particular class. They would be looking at the total program with the area staff. The MCPS program was built from grade to grade, and it would be the responsibility of the area associate superintendent to work with the principal and staff in taking a look at what was needed in that situation.

Dr. Pitt explained that their purpose was not to condemn everyone who did not succeed. Their purpose was to take a look at what was happening in that school and look at successful practices and try and move. He did not think there would be pressure on an individual teacher, but there would be pressure on the principal, the school staff, and the area staff. If some schools could succeed with the same youngsters, other schools should be able to do this with help. He hoped that they would be able to identify successful practices and give that school some support. If nothing happened, they needed to take a hard look at the situation; however, he did not think they would focus on one particular teacher as much as the school.

Dr. Cronin noted that the students generally took the functional tests in the first part of ninth grade, and he wondered whether MCPS would take a backward look at the junior high school that prepared these students for these tests. Dr. Scott replied that there would be a look as well as careful articulation between the two schools with respect to that program. Dr. Cronin asked if he had the authority to make those recommendations, and Dr. Scott replied that he did.

Mr. Ewing explained that he had missed the July 14 meeting because he had been out of town, and he had some questions to raise. He said that the plan to focus on those students who were in the school system over a certain time period was a very good idea, and something they had not done before. He was glad to see the emphasis on accountability and on individual school accountability. He hoped that no one thought that the way in which they were going about using those quantitative measures that they had was the last word in science. They had some goals achieved by consensus, and before the Board adopted these, he would like to have a description about how that consensus was achieved. He did not have the data staff used to review where they were and where they might go. He hoped they did not move in the direction of some degree of false specificity about all of this.

Mr. Ewing was concerned that they were not moving in the direction of some other issues. He asked whether there would be an attempt to move in the direction of doing some of the things the effective schools approach suggested. For example, an assessment of school climate began to get at what there was in the school community which

inhibits or retards the progress of students. He felt that this was a crucial part, and he did not see mention of this. He was concerned about how the plans of individual schools would be assessed. They did not have a listing or description of the strategies and approaches which schools could use, did use, and might use. He asked how Dr. Scott and the area superintendent know whether the plans were good or bad or promising strategies. He asked how they would know what to suggest in place of strategies. For example, they had not yet distilled knowledge of what did work. He was concerned about how these plans would be tied to the notion of how they planned to learn from what they did in any kind of systematic way. He did not see a link between what was done, what they learned from it, and how they were sure what they learned was what they should have learned and what they could apply. For example, how would they react if different directions were given in different administrative areas to solve what was essentially the same problem.

Dr. Pitt replied that this was such a complicated issue that it had been broken down into two parts. They had outlined a successful strategy which focused on what was a successful practice and tried to use a scientific approach to identifying that. They would evaluate a school and take a look at that school for a day or two with a team that had some training in observation. Based on that, they would come up with some data and identify some successful strategies which would be shared with other schools. When they started they would be using some things that were different, and they were not sure that all of them would work. He hoped they would develop a list of successful strategies, but they did not know the answer to the question of whether these were transferable. In regard to tests, Dr. Pitt commented that they were talking about an area of limited scientific knowledge. They knew that tests measured only a very small part of what people learned. However, at the present, the tests scores were the data that they could use across the board. They did want to develop CRT's which did more toward measuring what the curriculum taught, but they would have to do this in stages. They did not want to move into something until they were sure they knew what they were doing. One thing they did not want to do was establish criteria that were rigid which might discourage young people from going into higher level courses, for example. In addition to successful strategies, they had eight schools looking at the effective schools issue. This was a small, low-key project being done on a voluntary basis.

In regard to identifying what was successful, Dr. Scott reported that they had been working at that for some time. They had a major conference this year where they had large numbers of staff identifying practices that were successful for them. In addition, he was now sending out a newsletter regarding successful practices. On July 14, they had presented a proposal which built in a more rigorous look at identifying what was successful or what was promising. He explained that they would look at what a school was doing and whether or not it could be disseminated and shared with others.

Dr. Vance added that perhaps they should have provided the Board with

a copy of the format that schools would be using because there was a section in the plan that addressed school climate. They had tried to pull out significant aspects of the research and ask school personnel to respond. This would become part of the materials that the area office and Dr. Scott would review. In that same management plan, they had been asked to indicate how the school was organized and how staff and resources would be deployed. Dr. Vance reported that each school and each area office would share their goals, plans, and targets with parents. Included in the plan would be the school's and DEA's analysis of normative test data and other cumulative data. There would be information on balanced staffing, instructional and curriculum materials, and minigrant deployment. They would also have information on the results and recommendations from the previous year's PRAT visit. He asked that the issue they had yet to grapple with was a plan for monitoring. He suspected that they would be back to the Board before September with a reasonable approach to monitoring.

Mr. Ewing said it would be helpful to him to see a written description of that requirement. He had read a selection of plans from last year, and there were some that were excellent and some that were incomprehensible. He agreed that they needed a framework for a common set of data requirements. He asked if they were going to have a regular process for an annual report and an annual review of where they were going with all of this. Dr. Pitt replied that part of the annual report would include this. He noted that they were in the developmental stages of this, and it would take some time to get where they should be. He did expect that at the end of this first year they would try to report on some school by school basis with some standard way of approaching this. In regard to successful strategies, he hoped the area office would not dictate what schools should do. He thought staff in a school with a successful practice should be involved in working with and training another school staff that had not been as successful. However, this would take time and would probably involve staff training funds. Mr. Ewing hoped that they would not forget there might be circumstances where individual student needs were not being met, which had to come first. Dr. Pitt agreed and said he had no question about working with people who were not willing to try; however, he thought the great majority of people would be willing to try.

In regard to school climate, Dr. Cronin asked about the function of the WHOLE SCHOOL CATALOG. Dr. Scott replied that this provided schools with a set of instruments to assess where they were with respect to different aspects of school life including school climate. Dr. Pitt added that it had a variety of assessment tools that could be used by a local school. Dr. Cronin noted that if they did have a school with some difficulties, that school would have a mechanism to use. He suggested sharing a copy of the catalog with Mr. Sims of Alpha Phi Alpha.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that Mrs. DiFonzo had raised the question of the Asian student which was the opposite of the question raised by Mr. Sims. The Asian community said that on the average their students

performed very well, but they had students within the group who were having a lot of trouble. It seemed to him that Mr. Sims was saying that on the average black students did not perform as well, but there were students within this group who did very well and objected to being treated as though they were not performing. Mr. Ewing had commented that they were trying to help individual students, but somehow they were being caught up in averages of particular groups they had identified. Dr. Scott had hoped that what they did would help all students, and Dr. Shoenberg thought it would. Dr. Shoenberg said they were focusing on what they could count and average after they had counted. This was a limited number of things, and sometimes it was hard to move from those things to questions of atmosphere, although they did have some ways of assessing that. He was still uneasy that they were focusing on averages of particular groups and things they could count and average and that some other kinds of considerations were going to get left out of the evaluation process. He hoped they would not lose sight of individual students and how they felt about what they were doing and what they could accomplish, apart from averages and things they could count.

Dr. Pitt replied that this was a concern. He did not want anyone to think that test scores were the only goal, but they had to start some place. He thought that when a school looked at itself and set some goals they would tend to look at all the students and there would be more opportunity to look at an individual youngster. He agreed that this was a serious issue. They did need to recognize outstanding youngsters and encourage them to go to college and achieve as much as they could.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that he was impressed and enthused with the idea of basing more of their evaluation of success or failure on individual schools rather than the overall system. One thing that had always bothered him was to try and find out why children were not succeeding as to whether the program was at fault or the attitudes of the people involved in that program. Sometimes when they tried to move a successful program, it failed, perhaps because of attitudes. If they were going to examine on a school by school basis, they should be able to spot that. If this was discovered, they could work with the principals, the teachers, and maybe the whole school. They had schools exceeding the norms listed in the document, but they also had some schools that did not come close. He thought that this program would bring the schools in the middle range to their attention, and this was where they could make improvements to bring up the whole system. He hoped that they would still continue with their countywide process as they did the individual school measurements. He believed that both sets of numbers would go up.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if they had schools that already exceeded the norms listed in the paper. Dr. Scott replied that they had schools reaching the norms in some areas and failed them in other areas. With the Maryland Functional Tests, students had done well in reading, but in writing and citizenship the goal would be a challenge for all. He remarked that they felt it was imperative to set the goal high because it would be a challenge. Mrs. DiFonzo said he was

saying they did not have schools already exceeding all of the norms and each school would have something towards which they would have to strive.

Dr. Cronin noted that in some instances they eliminated certain schools or targets when they reported group scores because there were too few students in a particular racial group. He suggested they consider an academic IEP or a contract within a classroom. Teachers could set goals with students and both could sign off on these goals. He did not know whether they had ever tried to do contracts on a large scale. Dr. Scott replied that they had seen this particularly with the PRAT process in schools with very few minorities where it had gotten down to a very individualized focus on children and needs. Mrs. Praisner asked where and how the PRAT process related to this and whether the PRAT reviews would still continue. Dr. Scott replied that the PRAT process would be an additional check and an opportunity for schools to share the progress they were making. He saw this as a process external to the accountability process.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about the responsibility and the involvement of central office staffs in supporting the local schools in the attainment of this. Dr. Scott explained that one area would be in the identification of successful practices. In terms of accountability, central office staff could be helpful in working with schools that were not making the progress they would like them to make. Mrs. Praisner asked where their involvement would come in. For example, would the involvement be at the area office level, the deputy's office, or Dr. Scott's office. Dr. Scott thought it would come at the area level given that he would be working very closely with the areas and said that between them they could involve central staff as needed. Dr. Pitt added that they would use the central staff in working with the CRT's and the honors programs. Mrs. Praisner was wondering about Dr. Martin's shop, Dr. Fountain's shop and Mrs. Bell's office. Dr. Vance replied that part of the process was designed for staff from the area offices to work with staff from the local schools and to consider requests for support. These requests might include EYE, staff development, special education, etc. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that some of the contracting of supports for the local school might involve the obligating of central and area office staff. Dr. Vance added that this was part of the accountability extension beyond the local school and the area level to DEA, Human Relations, QIE, Supportive Services, etc. Mrs. Praisner thought that in annual reports they might see some identification of the way the central offices had supported the local schools' attainment of their objectives.

Mrs. Praisner asked how they would take account of mobility rates and how they would work with the local school. Dr. Scott replied that for accountability purposes they would look at students who had been in the school system two or more years which was directly related to the mobility issue. This would allow schools an opportunity to work with students. In regard to goal setting, Dr. Scott said the area superintendent could look at a school with unique circumstances and set some interim goals. Dr. Pitt added that this was not a clear cut

area. They were going to have to make some judgments here, and for that reason Dr. Scott and the area superintendents would be looking at this. He said they were looking at longitudinal growth; however, they would not forget about youngsters new to the school system. Mrs. Praisner noted that mobility rates now referred to the number of years in the school and not the number of years in the school system.

Dr. Pitt replied that they would be talking about youngsters who were in the system but not necessarily in a particular school. However, they recognized that an individual school might have an unusual mobility factor and might change 70 percent of their students. They recognized this might be a problem. This did not mean they would not work with those youngsters. Mrs. Praisner asked if they had identified what they meant by high mobility rate and low mobility rate. Dr. Scott explained that they had identified this from the standpoint of whether or not a student had been in the school system two years or not. Mrs. Praisner suggested that at some point they were going to have to look at that school and say, "this is high" in relationship to the county or the rest of the schools in that area.

Dr. Pitt replied that they had not really answered that yet but were raising that question. He hoped that in a year or so they might have some guidelines. However, as they reviewed the data, they might say such and such a school was an example of where mobility was a factor. Mrs. Praisner said they would be looking at the Maryland tests in the high school for students who had been in MCPS for two or more years. She asked when the make-up tests were given in the tenth grade. Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, replied that for all the tests except for writing, students would have multiple chances to take the tests. He explained that rather than looking at the results of a test in a certain period, they would be looking at the cumulative record of what had happened in each school.

Mrs. Praisner noted that this was a preliminary presentation to the Board. She wondered what plans they had for working with principals and the staffs of local schools. It seemed to her that one of the most important things for success was acceptance and understanding of what was expected and what was not expected. Dr. Pitt replied that he had had a meeting with all principals, all resource teachers, and all members of the central staff and had talked about local school accountability. Dr. Vance added that with the probable exception of the accountability section, bits and pieces of the plan were in place in the schools and in the areas. As to how they were going to pull this together, he said he would like to defer this response to the next Board meeting. Mrs. Praisner assumed that future recommendations and discussions would involve an administrative team review which includes principals. Dr. Pitt replied that they would. He pointed out that he and Dr. Vance had moved into their roles as of July 1, and it would take some time to make changes.

Mr. Ewing asked if the goals would be the same for all schools and all students, but the time frame within which they might be expected to achieve the goals would vary. Dr. Scott replied that this was

correct. Mr. Ewing hoped that this could be made very clear to everyone because there was the danger that the variation in time frame would be seen by some as letting people off the hook. Dr. Pitt commented that this was a very good point. He thought they might recognize that a school had made significant movement even though they had not achieved the county goals.

Mr. Ewing thought there was a paradox here. He recalled that they had been at this business of addressing the question of how to improve minority achievement for at least 15 years with varying degrees of seriousness on the part of the Board. He thought the present Board was very committed, and he was impressed with the commitment shown by Dr. Pitt and the senior staff. However, in those years, they had not achieved the goal that they had been seeking. For that reason, it was important to think about what they had learned and to apply what they had learned. This was very critical. He did not know how to explain that paradox because it wasn't that they lacked good staff or dedicated teachers. It had not worked for a large number of students, and there were people in the community who were increasingly dissatisfied. Mr. Ewing hoped that this new level of emphasis and dedication would bring it about. He hoped that they would all take stock at least once a year and make such revisions as were indicated. He said they should do everything they could to summarize their experiences honestly and candidly so they would know what worked and why and what failed and why. He said they had not liked that level of self-examination much, but he thought they had to do more of it.

Mrs. DiFonzo commented that they had a sense of where the teachers, the principals, the area offices, and the central office fit in. She would hope that in this whole process there was a place for parents and a responsibility on the part of the student. If they did not include that student as an active participant, they might just beat their heads against the wall. She thought they needed to reach out and include communities.

Dr. Cronin remarked that the school system was but one element of the success of black children. They were the educational element, and there were also the social, housing, and community aspects. For example, the newspapers had a story about building a bridge to Lincoln Park to end the isolation of that community. He suggested that they had to send a message out to the political leaders that it was time to do something on a large scale in the community and what the school system was capable of doing. Dr. Cronin said they were talking about special staffing resources, minigrant resources, QIE resources, and teacher training issues. He wondered if they were not approaching a school-based budget formula of some sort. He was thinking of discretionary funds available to the principal to buy services. Dr. Pitt replied that they were not there yet. He remarked that they could look at all the other things in society that affected people, but as a school system they needed to be leading the charge and not following. However, he recognized they needed to work with groups and parents. He emphasized that he, the top staff, and most of the people in the school system were committed to making this

effort.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about next steps. Dr. Pitt replied that they would move ahead and inform the system of the process they were following. He said they had clearly stated what Dr. Scott's role was and where they were in trying to define successful practices. Mrs. Praisner commented that the Board would be receiving reports on the status of issues. Dr. Pitt agreed to provide Board members with information they had requested. By next June, they hoped to have recommendations on final examinations, Algebra Grade 9, and honors courses. In the next few weeks he would be making a decision about DEA and the Area Office. Mrs. Praisner thanked staff for a comprehensive discussion.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing stated that he had heard there had been comments about some changes in the B-CC Cluster resolution. He suggested that the resolution be redrafted rather than come to a vote.
2. Dr. Cronin said that the Medical Advisory Committee had given the Board a recommendation on smoking. He was prepared to raise the issue of no smoking in all schools and asked if this had been scheduled. Mrs. Praisner explained that they usually received the superintendent's response to a committee report. Dr. Pitt said that he wanted to talk to high school principals before he provided the Board with his reactions to the report. He expected that he would be back to this topic in October. Mrs. Praisner recalled that the Board had asked for reports on how the two nonsmoking schools were progressing.
3. Mr. Goldensohn indicated that he would be writing a memo on the transfer of a school building to Montgomery County. He did not know what responsibilities the Board had vis a vis liability with those buildings because they were the technical owners of some of these buildings. Mrs. Praisner explained that the issue was complicated by the fact that some schools still had state bonded indebtedness. She asked that staff share information on this issue with Mr. Goldensohn.

RESOLUTION NO. 401-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - AUGUST 18, 1987

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on August 18, 1987, at 1 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or

any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

RESOLVED, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at 4:15 p.m. to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 402-87 Re: MINUTES OF MAY 26, 1987

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of May 26, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 403-87 Re: MINUTES OF JUNE 2, 1987

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of June 2, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 404-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-8

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That in BOE Appeal No. 1987-8, the Board grant the request to withdraw the appeal.

RESOLUTION NO. 405-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-12

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That in BOE Appeal No. 1987-12, the Board grant the request to withdraw the appeal.

RESOLUTION NO. 406-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-14

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That an extension to August 5, 1987, be granted in BOE Appeal No. 1987-14.

Re: RITCHIE PARK ES

Mrs. Praisner reported that the Board had received a request for reconsideration of the Ritchie Park decision. On the advice of the Board's attorney, this would require a motion by someone voting on the prevailing side. She asked if there were any motions to reconsider. She declared that there were no motions.

RESOLUTION NO. 407-87 Re: MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Slye (on May 26), the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin and Dr. Shoenberg abstaining:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop and propose to the Board for its approval by the fall of 1987 a management improvement program aimed at achieving cost savings through productivity gains and other approaches to increased efficiency; and be it further

RESOLVED, That there should be associated with this a system of recognition and cash awards for those who have achieved demonstrated efficiencies; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this should be done in consultation with employee organizations.

RESOLUTION NO. 408-87 Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION ON THE RENEWAL OF COMMITMENT TO THE B-CC CLUSTER

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board president appoint a committee of Board members to come up with a proposal for the commitment to the B-CC cluster.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Annual Report of the Office of the Board of Education
2. Master Calendar of Board Meetings
3. Educational Specifications for Whitman High School Modernization

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw